JANUARY, 1967 VOL. IV, NO. 1

PERSUASION ®

VIEWS

THE DRAFT
PART V: WHO SHALL SERVE?.....by David J. Dawson

REVIEWS

AN AMERICAN TRAGEDY
a review of *Anti-intellectualism in American Life*.....by Joan Kennedy Taylor

JOAN KENNEDY TAYLOR, editor 50¢

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Published monthly by Persuasion, Inc., 260 West 86th Street, New York, N. Y. 10024. Subscription rate: $4.00 per year ($5.00 outside U. S., Canada and Mexico). Canadian residents add 8% foreign exchange.

Please include ZIP cope number with your address.

Publisher.....*David J. Dawson*
Editor.....*Joan Kennedy Taylor*
Staff.....*Elenore Boddy*
Avis Brick
Joyce Jones
Lois Roberts

Persuasion is a trade mark registered with the United States Patent Office.

Copyright © 1967 by Persuasion, Inc.

All rights reserved—no reproduction in whole or in part without permission.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JANUARY, 1967 VOL. IV, NO. 1

VIEWS

The Draft

Part V: Who Shall Serve?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Who shall serve? Who will voluntarily undergo the perils, privations and restrictions of military life?

He who so chooses.

That has been a major point of my last two articles. The draft violates the principle that a man's labor is his property, for him to use and dispose of, rather than being a natural resource. Labor, like all other property, should be subject to trade, not coercion. Therefore, the proper military force is a voluntary and professional one.

The two views of labor--as natural resource and as property--have corollary approaches to the question of how men enter particular jobs.

The natural resource approach holds that men should (although "regrettably" they rarely do) choose their occupation from a sense of obligation, not from a desire for gain. I stated in an earlier article that the idea of obligation, especially military obligation, is almost a truism among legislators, public and miliary officials, and not a few of the citizenry. This is the idea that a citizen at birth incurs an involuntary and inescapable obligation to someday serve his nation at the discretion of its government, in return for the protections, privileges, and other advantages which the nation provides the citizen. Notice that this obligation is involuntary, incurred at birth, and therefore is not a trade.

If this were so, then it would be proper to expect all men to be equally liable for service to the nation and equally willing to serve, and that they should go where they are assigned and do what they are told.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the other hand, the view that labor is property inevitably leads to the principle of division of labor. This is the principle upon which a voluntary army must be based. Men select what they will do on the basis of what in their judgment will best suit their own interests. This will lead to a general increase in productivity and to larger personal income, since desire and specialized skill are wedded to a self-evaluation of ability which is then tested objectively in the marketplace. Often, a man will try his hand at several careers before he brings together the three elements of desire, ability, and production which are objectively valuable to others. But always his guide is his own self-interest, his means is choice, his milieu is freedom.

This is the way it should be. But is there evidence that what should be the case could actually be the case? So far, my argument has sprung largely from the nature of liberty and the nature of a free society's economy. But do men find it to their self-interest, even now, to join the armed forces of the United States? What is it that they join for? Or, to put the problem another way, is there a division of labor today in the military services? Yes, but it is diluted, and therefore efficiency is diluted, by the draft.

Studies in this area have been made by both the Department of Defense and the Bureau of Census. They reveal that, even with a draft in effect, men join the armed forces for a wide variety of reasons.

Before I examine these studies, it is important to discuss one factor that influences military enlistment--military pay. The men in the U.S. armed forces are among the most poorly paid of any industrial nation. Canada pays her soldiers more, and has no draft. Great Britain, who has discontinued her draft,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pays more. The soldiers of France and West Germany, even though many of them are conscripted, are paid better than ours, although the so-called standard of living in this country is higher than in any other. Thousands of families of American military men are receiving welfare; thousands of military fathers and husbands work at additional outside jobs just to meet their basic expenses. This fact has limited enlistment, but has not prevented it.

The Department of Defense study was made of a large sampling of active duty personnel as of October 31, 1964. The question "What was the single most important reason for your original entry into active military service?" was asked of enlisted personnel on their first tour of duty. Only 37.1 per cent came in because they thought they would have been drafted anyway. This figure includes 24.2 per cent who enlisted "to fulfill my military obligation at the time of my choice."

On the other hand, despite the facts of incredibly low pay and the clear presence of a growing war, 54.7 per cent freely entered, not to escape the pressures of the draft, but because military service was some positive value to them. About 5 per cent saw "career opportunities" better in the military, 10.3 per cent came in "for the travel, excitement, and new experience" of military life; 11.8 per cent wanted "to become more mature and self-reliant"; 22.5 per cent wanted "to learn a trade that would be valuable in civilian life" or saw an "opportunity for advanced education and professional training." Among officers, who in the main had better educations than enlisted men and therefore could expect to do well in civilian competition for jobs, 48.7 per cent were nonetheless motivated by reasons other than the draft.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The U.S. Census Bureau did a correlative survey to the above study, among civilian men, sixteen to thirty-four years old.

The following question was asked of nonveterans who were not enrolled in school in the sixteen- to nineteen-year ago group: "Based on the military service you have seen, how does military work compare with your present, full-time civilian job?"

Military pay was seen to be better by only 13.5 per cent. On the other hand, 46.3 per cent saw military retirement plans, medical plans, and other fringe benefits as better (only 21.6 per cent thought these factors were better in civilian life). The military was evaluated by 37.7 per cent as giving steadier, more secure work; 27.9 per cent saw this as more likely in the civilian area.

As for the chances for further training in job skills, 41.6 per cent saw more opportunity in civilian life, while only 35.5 per cent thought the military better. Incidentally, that portion of the group who had less than a high school education voted 45.9 per cent for the military, as against 29.8 per cent for the civilian.

As a place to be a leader, 36.8 per cent rated the military higher, and 29.9 per cent saw the civilian area as preferable.

When these same questions were put to veterans under the age of thirty-four, it is not surprising that 91 per cent of them considered civilian pay better than military pay. But 55 per cent rated retirement plans, medical plans, and other fringe benefits as superior in the military; 40.5 per cent saw the military as better at providing steady, secure work (only 26.5

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

per cent held that civilian jobs were steadier and more secure); and 36.9 per cent saw the military as better in providing chances at training, as against 41.3 per cent who so viewed civilian training.

This Bureau of Census study asked nonveterans between the ages of sixteen and twenty-five to answer a hypothetical question: "If there was no draft now, and you had no military obligation at all, which condition would be most likely to get you to volunteer?" While such a question requires an extreme act of imagination to answer, the answers do indicate what sorts of considerations motivate military enlistments.

Pay alone would be sufficient motivation for 20.7 per cent if it were raised to a level considerably higher than that available to them in the civilian sector. But only 4.4 per cent would prefer a service life if the available pay scales were equal.

However, the single most important inducement to these nonveterans was training. Guaranteed training in a job or skill useful in civilian life was viewed by 29.4 per cent as the condition most likely to get them to volunteer (34 per cent of those members of the sample who had less than a high school education were most interested in training; while only 8.3 per cent of those with some college considered it a decisive inducement).

In the same vein, 25.2 per cent of the high school graduates would consider enlisting if they were sent to a civilian college at government expense as part of their active service. Among those with some college education, 13.2 per cent saw a chance at officer's training and a commission as the most important inducement for them.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These statistics have been cited here simply as indicators of the complexity that lies behind job decisions. Even in the context of the draft itself this process of evaluation goes on.

At one point in the June 1966 Hearings of the House Armed Services Committee, when someone suggested that if pay and "other emoluments" were sufficiently raised no draft would be needed, General Hershey answered by saying, "Personally I don't want to be defended by individuals who are there for no other reason than the money."

Since this statement was specifically intended to be a defense of forced conscription, it sounds as if the General is saying that he prefers to be defended by individuals who are there because they don't want to be. But of course this would not be a useful criterion for selecting an effective army. What the General really seems to mean is that he wants to force men into a low paying army and then assume that they are there through dedication. A few sentences later he refers to a voluntary organization, the Boy Scouts, whose executives are also poorly paid, "because I still think there ought to be some other reasons to keep them there."

The very legislators and officials who state that it is obligation, not self-interest, which should populate the armed forces have rigged things so that a kind of semi-suppressed, half-effective choice still operates. The draft pulls men in for two years. The military knows that this is inadequate because it results in a constant turnover. No regiment and no division can be at top capability if it is continually losing personnel. To correct this situation, options have been created for the potential draftee. There are over fifty programs of special training available in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

armed services. The catch is that to get into such a special program one must enlist for a longer period of time than that required of the draftee. Many men do this, because of the high premium they place on gaining useful skills. And when they do get the skills, they leave the service for the civilian world of reasonable pay scales.

Thus the military rely on self-interest to bring them the personnel for their more technical operations. But only 25 per cent of them re-enlist.

When one looks closely at the whole system, the wonder is that anyone today would find it to his self-interest to join. But hundreds of thousands still do. And the reasons that they do point to the changes that might be made to attract even more men. The most important motive for enlistment is not pay, but training. Training provides a way for someone trapped by poverty, or family problems, or bigotry, to break out of the trap by gaining a skill that makes it possible for him to live a decent life.

This is not a new thing. It was so prevalent a thing for immigrants to join the army in the nineteenth century that some thought it was populated solely by Irishmen. Between 1847 and 1851, according to the *Columbia Encyclopedia,* 1,600,000 Irishmen emigrated because of the potato famine, most of them to the United States. Many of them found a career in the U.S. Army, so that a period movie on the U.S. cavalry is not complete without a blaspheming Irish sergeant with a heart of gold.

Today, many questions are being asked, in Congress and in the newspapers, about the number of Negroes in the armed forces. Is it disproportionately high? These questions do not sufficiently differentiate between

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enlistments and draftees. From the time of Napolean, the draft has focused on those who could protest the least politically--if there is any tendency toward taking Negroes as draftees in preference to other citizens for this reason, civil rights leaders are quite right to try to counterbalance this by putting political pressure on the Selective Service System. It can only be hoped that they will also protest the new attempt to draft educational rejects (a large per cent of whom are Negro) in order to force training upon them to fit them for "citizenship."

But to the extent that our civilian society in fact makes it harder for a Negro to obtain training and a job with possible advancement, it would not be surprising to find that Negro enlistments in the armed forces are large compared to enlistments from the population as a whole. There is some evidence even now that this may be so. In the June Hearings, General Hershey was aked if it were true that a disproportionate number of Negroes were being drafted and eventually sent to Vietnam. Hershey replied that there was no question but that the number of Negroes on the casualty lists has been large, but that this was because the re-enlistment rate among Negroes was 46 per cent. "And the result is that many of them are up to non-commissioned officer."

Instead of using the draft to force the supposedly disadvantaged into the military for their own good, why not attract those who want to climb out of the slums by offering training, and then couple this with a pay scale that will hold them in the service of their own free will. Only with a pay increase can military service continue to attract those who have completed their training and gained a marketable skill.

In the studies cited there were some indications of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

changes in approach which, if made by the military, might well release a flood of potential volunteers. For instance, 78.2 per cent of the veterans under thirty-four, as well as almost the same percentage of nonveterans aged sixteen to nineteen, were of the opinion that a military job did not grant the same freedom as a civilian one to do the task the way the person doing it thought best. Since technical work requires the application of intelligence, and a man's mind does not function at its best going through rote routines, this finding suggests that more and better technicians might be attracted to the armed forces if given more freedom in the individual performance of their specialty.

It is also possible that the military needs to reorganize its methods of advancement. One of the most important motivations there is for a career man is the knowledge that if he is good at his job he can advance. In the studies, 55.8 per cent of the veterans (and an almost equal percentage of the sixteen- to nineteen-year age group) thought the civilian area offered better chances for advancement. Only 22.5 per cent of the veterans thought their chances were better in the service.

The last negative area reported is much more intangible than those already mentioned. It has to do with whether a military life is considered to be "highly respected" in contrast to civilian life. In the opinion of those questioned, it is not. Only 13.6 per cent of the veterans *and* of the sixteen- to nineteen-year-old nonveterans thought it was, while 54 per cent of the former and 57 per cent of the latter thought civilian occupations in general were much more respected.

It is hard to say what factors are responsible for this clouding of the military image. For instance,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this is a profession into which men can be, and are, forced--hardly a big selling point. There is no doubt that the military could look with profit into how families are treated, what recreational facilities are available, what the living quarters are like--not just at showcase bases, but at all bases. The status of the profession could only improve once pay was raised, the draft was ended, and life "in" was made more in tune with life "outside."

Only a little imagination is needed to see what would happen if the whole system were designed to attract and hold men by offering them values, instead of enforced obligations. For the most encouraging thing that these studies bring out is the remnants of choice in the present system, despite its obvious lacks.

Who shall serve? Men whose only common bond is that they have been coerced and want to be elsewhere?

Or men who voluntarily choose military life to better themselves with training, men who are specialists in fields they have chosen, men who want a pay commensurate with their skills and advancement as their ability warrants, men who want secure work and reasonable freedom to improve the methods of doing it? The evidence shows that these men are available.

By whom do *you* want to be defended?

--David J. Dawson

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REVIEWS

An American Tragedy

Anti-intellectualism in American Life
by Richard Hofstadter, Knopf, New York, 1963

The United States was founded by a group of intellectual activists, men who studied political theory and economics and philosophy, and yet did not hesitate to plunge themselves into the daily business of planning and running a government. Today, men of theory and men of practice often seem to regard each other from opposite sides of a gulf. The "practical" politician or businessman looks with bewilderment and some hostility on the "ivory-towered" intellectual, and is regarded in turn as crass. How did we get from there to here? Professor Hofstadter, who won a Pulitzer Prize in 1964 with this book, has provided us with some illuminating and provocative historical suggestions.

His thesis is that anti-intellectual strains developed very early in American history and were fostered by four social trends: (1)the rise of evangelical religion; (2)political egalitarianism; (3)the displacement of the gentleman-merchant by the self-made manufacturer which accompanied the industrialization of the country; and (4)the educational policies which culminated in the 40's and 50's in the "life-adjustment" approach to education. This book, which is an examination of the histories of these trends, also provides information on two points which Mr. Hofstadter does not specifically identify: (1)the point that American scholars and intellectuals have never been consistently pro-*laissez faire* and there-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fore periods of relative economic freedom have been periods of the decline in influence of the intellectual; and (2)the point that pragmatism, which has been called the uniquely American philosophy, grew out of a pre-existing and widely held American attitude which exalted practice above theory, character (especially the so-called Christian virtues of piety, frugality and diligence) above brilliance, and homespun folksiness above acquaintance with the fruits of Western civilization.

If it had not been for the Puritans, Professor Hofstadter believes, this country would not have been founded on the principles that it was. The Puritan ministry of New England which dominated American colonial cultural life for a time was "as close to being an intellectual ruling class--or, more properly, a class of intellectuals intimately associated with a ruling power--as America ever had." (p. 59) They believed strongly in the efficacy of intellect, an attitude which was the necessary germinating ground for that remarkable group of men we now call the Founding Fathers. Under Puritan rule, New England, while still a small outpost of civilization on the edge of an untracked and savage wilderness, had a "system of grammar and elementary schools, a printing press, and some creditable libraries. The ministers produced a remarkable literature of sermons, histories and verse, and, in time, a literature of political writing of the Revolutionary era. They laid the basis of an educational system and, one might add, of a community morale in matters of study which made New England and the New England mind distinguished in the history of American culture for three centuries." (p. 61) Contrary to what is held in the popular attitude today, Mr. Hofstadter points out that the Puritan ministry did not lead the religious persecutions for which the New England of the time is also known, but that many

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ministers lagged behind the proddings of a more intolerant general public.

In the mid-eighteenth century, a period known as the Great Awakening began. This was a period of religious revivals, characterized by a split within the churches which pitted against each other formalism and liberal humanism on the one hand and fervor and anti-intellectualism on the other. Revivalist ministers sprang up, at first in the Dutch Reform and Presbyterian churches, later spreading to other sects. The "enthusiasts," as they were called, emphasized the emotional and spontaneous in religion and attacked the assumption that ministers should be learned professionals who studied and conveyed a rational understanding of doctrine.

The New England churches had been so strongly involved in the ideals of scholarship and education that the so-called liberal education had been developed as a necessary training for the ministry. "During the entire colonial period all but five per cent of the clergymen of the New England Congregational churches had college degrees.... The founding fathers of colonial education saw no difference between the basic education appropriate for a cleric and that appropriate for any other liberally educated man. The idea of a distinctively theological seminary...was outside their ken." (p. 60) While they were still under the influence of these New England churches, the revivalists were not hostile to education--in fact, "men influenced by the revivals" (p. 72) founded Princeton, Brown, Rutgers and Dartmouth. But as the Midwest and the West were settled, many of the settlers left their schools and churches behind, and saw no immediate need of them on the frontier. The evangelists followed these settlers and captured their imaginations and emotions. In order to do this, reviv-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

alism became more primitive and emotional as it moved South and West. Evangelists found neighborhoods where there had never been a school and towns which had no books, not even a complete Bible. The evangelists, points out Hofstadter, were not destroyers of culture: "The best of them were clearly the intellectual and cultural superiors of their environment, and the poorest of them could hardly have made it worse." (p. 79)

All of this happened in the wake of a new form of Christianity, under which "churches became *voluntary* organizations" (p. 82) as religious disunity led to religious multiplicity and in turn to religious liberty. In 1790, "perhaps as many as ninety per cent of the Americans were unchurched...." (p. 82) Under the emotional appeal of revivalism, many of these unchurched Americans were induced to rejoin--not because a church attempted to *convince* them, but because it *excited* them. The religious life of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries was characterized by waves of revivals, culminating in the world fame of men like Dwight L. Moody and Billy Sunday, who scorned written sermons as lacking in spontaneity and looked upon secular culture as a threat to religious salvation. Within each denomination, however, there were forces which never died out completely who were in favor of an educated, salaried ministry. By the time of the twentieth century, the fundamentalist-revivalists were embattled, within their churches and without, against the forces of modernity.

"The two new notes which are evident in a most striking form in Billy Sunday's rhetoric, the note of toughness and the note of ridicule and denunciation, may be taken as the signal manifestations of...what I would call the one-hundred per cent mentality--a mind totally committed to the full range of the domi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nant popular fatuities and determined that no one shall have the right to challenge them. This type of mentality is a relatively recent synthesis of fundamentalist religion and fundamentalist Americanism, very often with a heavy overlay of severe fundamentalist morality." (p. 118-119) Darwinism, scholarly biblical criticism and the move for a "social gospel" all provided challenges to this attitude. They were all dangerous because they were modern. It is this attitude that has influenced and is by Hofstadter totally identified with the Conservative movement in politics. What was in the 1920's "the Ku Klux Klan movement, the rigid defense of Prohibition, the Scopes evolution trial, and the campaign against Al Smith in 1928" (p. 123) is identified by him as becoming "a fanatical right-wing opposition to the New Deal" (p. 131), the McCarthy investigations of the 1950's and the John Birch Society. "The fundamentalist mind ... cannot find serious importance in what it believes to be trifling degrees of difference: liberals support measures that are for all practical purposes socialistic, and socialism is nothing more than a variant of Communism, which, as everyone knows, is atheism." (p. 135)

Just as the believer in evangelical religion saw it as championing "the truths of the heart" as against the intellectual elite, so the concept of "the common man" in politics was pitted successively against the idea of the ineffectual intellectual reformer, and, more recently, that of the sinister intellectual expert.

"When the United States began its national existence," writes Hofstadter, "the relationship between intellect and power was not a problem." (p. 145) But within the lifetime of the Founding Fathers, they were being attacked as being too intellectual. An anonymous pamphlet in 1796 tried to warn readers against

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the possible presidency of Thomas Jefferson on the ground that Jefferson was a philosopher, which meant he had "'a disposition to reason from certain principles, and not from the true nature of man; a proneness to predicate all his measures on certain abstract theories, formed in the recess of his cabinet, and not on the existing state of things and circumstances; an inertness of mind, as applied to governmental policy, a wavering of disposition when great and sudden emergencies demand promptness of decision and energy of action.'" (quoted on p. 147)

A derogatory campaign against Jefferson in 1800 included many attacks similar to this one by Federalist pamphleteers and by the established clergy. But if educated patricians could be anti-intellectual, this did not lead egalitarians to champion intellectuality. "Even in its earliest days, the egalitarian impulse in America was linked with a distrust for what in its germinal form may be called political specialization and in its later forms expertise." (p. 151) The common man should decide political issues for himself; the educated man had, from this point of view, no information and no tools which would avail him better than the uninformed common sense of the ordinary citizen.

More than that, the intellectual was a target of suspicion. He claimed a status difference. In the early days of the Republic, the intellectual was a gentleman in a country which wished to level European class distinctions. It was the campaigns between Jackson and John Quincy Adams in 1824 and 1828 which, according to Professor Hofstadter, "symbolized what America had been and what it would become." (p. 158) Adams was an intellectual, the last in a line of gentleman-presidents. He had studied at many universities, here and abroad, had taught at Harvard, and wished to establish a national university, a nation-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

al observatory, federal aid to science, and governmental support of the arts. Jackson was considered fortunate to have "escaped" formal education, and opposed federal support of the arts and sciences because the arts and sciences were of no practical consequence. His victory was a victory for the anti-intellectual fighting man over the image of the decadent intellectual aristocrat, and it set the tone for nineteenth-century American politics. Candidate after candidate stressed his identification with the interests of the voters by using as campaign issues log cabin origins, military resoluteness, lack of higher education, and often a hard-drinking masculinity. By 1870, the educated man who was interested in political action was relegated to a role on the sidelines as what Hofstadter calls a "genteel reformer" whose aim was selfless public service and civil-service reform, and who had little influence either on the politicians or on the general public. It was not until Theodore Roosevelt successfully fought the political stigma of a college education, grammatical speech, and a fashionable background that the man of education came back into politics in a new role, and "the era of the scholar as expert was about to begin." (p.196)

It was during the so-called Progressive era, ushered in by T.R., that, says Hofstadter, "The country seems to have been affected by a sort of spiritual hunger, a yearning to apply to social problems the principles of Christian morality which had always characterized its creed but too rarely its behavior." (p. 197) To do this, government had to "control" the power of business--and to do *that*, government had of necessity to become more complex. So the intellectual was needed at last as an expert public servant. First, in state governments, such as the "Wisconsin idea" in 1900 of Robert La Follette, and then in Washington, under the presidential administrations of Theodore

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, the intellectual expert offered technical advice on agriculture and engineering, regulated railroads, and was consulted about taxation. There were reactions against such expertise, especially after World War I, when "The public turned on the intellectuals as the prophets of false and needless reforms, as architects of the administrative state, as supporters of the war, even as ur-Bolsheviks; the intellectuals turned on America as a nation of boobs, Babbitts, and fanatics. Those who were young and free enough expatriated themselves; the others stayed home and read Mencken. It would take a depression and another era of reform to overcome this estrangement." (p. 213)

The era of reform referred to was the New Deal. "The New Deal gave thousands of jobs to young lawyers and economists, who flocked to Washington to staff its newly created agencies of regulation; the research, artistic, and theater projects of the WPA and NYA helped unemployed artists, intellectuals, and college students....Ideas, theories, criticisms took on a new value, and the place to go for them was to men who were intellectually trained. The economic collapse had demonstrated that such men were needed, but it was the New Deal that showed how they could make themselves felt." (p. 214) The growth of the power of the experts led to a growth of hostility toward them. Before World War II, some businessmen and politicians and members of the general public felt alarm, not, says Hofstadter, without cause, for although it was not true that the professors were running Washington, "it had now become a prerogative of experts to set the very terms in which the issues were perceived, to define the contours of economic and social issues." (p. 217) After the war, particularly in the defeat of Adlai Stevenson in 1952 and in what Hofstadter calls "the ugly image of McCarthy," the intellectuals drew the conclusion that they were

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being repudiated by the public, even though they were still employed by the same politicians who called them "eggheads." Although this was not fully true (it is pointed out that Stevenson in defeat got more votes than Truman did when he won the 1948 election), it was not until the administration of John F. Kennedy that "ceremonial recognition of culture" was restored to Washington. "From time to time," says Hofstadter, "the reputation and recognition of intellect in politics may vary, but the demand for expertise seems constantly to rise." (p. 229)

The third force in American history which has been traditionally anti-intellectual is the business community, and Hofstadter sees the hostility which businessmen feel toward intellectuals as "a suspicion of intellect itself, it is part of the extensive American devotion to practicality and direct experience which ramifies through almost every area of American life....Practical vigor is a virtue; what has been spiritually crippling in our history is the tendency to make a mystique of practicality." (p. 236-237) Here again, Hofstadter sees a religious aspect to the attitude he is describing. In speaking of "the fear of mind and the disdain for culture," (p. 238) he says: "They rest upon two pervasive American attitudes toward civilization and personal religion--first, a widely shared contempt for the past; and second, an ethos of self-help and personal advancement in which even religious faith becomes merely an agency of practicality." (p. 238) Those who emigrated to America, he suggests, set a premium upon inventiveness and "know-how" as against tradition or history--a protest against monarchy, superstition and pessimism too often led to a disdain for all contemplation. In the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, gentleman-merchants were interested in patronizing learning, science and the arts; in being actively involved in politics; and in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leading a life of "dignified leisure." They were themselves interested in the intellectual life, and their trading contacts with Europe and the Orient kept them cosmopolitan. But the move West, by which people had left behind their ties to established churches and schools, also left behind cultural institutions. The self-made millionaire became a social ideal that replaced that of the leisured man of affairs. "Ideally, the self-made man is one whose success does not depend on formal education and for whom personal culture, other than in his business character, is unimportant." (p. 254) A literature of self-help arose, often written by clergymen, and stressing not technical skills but character. Character was often opposed to genius, or brilliance, which were suspected as unstable even though these books often advocated schooling; "with all this there went a persistent hostility to formal education and a countervailing cult of experience." (p. 257) It was generally agreed that education should be more practical and that higher education had no practical use in business. Free public elementary education was generally considered to be a good thing as it supplied a disciplined working class, but articles were written suggesting that high schools be replaced by vocational training. By the turn of the century, some education became useful to a business career, and by 1950, according to one survey, 75.6 per cent of the top business executives had some college education and many had been to graduate school. However, the colleges themselves had become more vocational, and so the disappearance of the self-made man did not mark the disappearance of anti-intellectualism in the business community. "It no longer takes the form of ridiculing the value of college or other formal education in preparation for business, but of selective recruiting governed by narrow vocational principles." (p.263)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Hofstadter sees the literature of "religious practicality," written by Norman Vincent Peale and others, as the debased descendant of the literature of self-help. "In the old self-help system, faith led to character and character to a successful manipulation of the world; in the new system, faith leads directly to a capacity for self-manipulation, which is believed to be the key to health, wealth, popularity, or peace of mind." (p. 266) Norman Vincent Peale is quoted as saying, "The best place to get a new and workable idea for your business is in the type of church service described in this chapter." (p. 265) This approach, points out Hofstadter, is anti-intellectual, not only in being essentially a belief in magic, but by representing "a withdrawal from reality, a repudiation of all philosophies whose business is an engagement with real problems." (p.269)

The theme of the importance of practicality and of "a popular culture that has been proudly convinced of its ability to get along--indeed, to get along better--without the benefits of formal knowledge, even without applied science" (p. 272) is not restricted to businessmen, but is also found traditionally in rural areas, whose inhabitants often have resisted the most rudimentary agricultural improvements, preferring until the late nineteenth century to sow, reap and mow "in accordance with the phases of the moon." (p. 276) Farmers were opposed to the establishment of land-grant agricultural colleges after the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862, not because of any opposition to government aid, but because they considered such institutions useless. "The essential point here is that this much-needed fusion was achieved only after a century of agitation by agricultural reformers in the teeth of a widespread and extremely obstinate conviction among working farmers that theory has nothing to offer to practice." (p. 282)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The first representative of the intellectual life whom the child meets is usually his teacher. American life has been characterized by an enthusiasm about elementary education coupled with a reluctance to pay those who are to provide it. From colonial times, when "communities sometimes had to resort to indentured servants for teachers" (p. 313) to the last decade, when it was reported "that a city in Michigan pays its teachers $400 a year less than its garbage collectors," (p. 310) American school children have been aware that their teachers are underpaid and have little or no social standing. This is not the universal fate of teachers. "In countries where the intellectual functions of education are highly valued, like France, Germany, and the Scandinavian countries, the teacher, especially the secondary-school teacher, is likely to be an important local figure representing a personal and vocational ideal worthy of emulation." (p. 310)

Perhaps one of the most unusual aspects of American anti-intellectualism is that one of its most outspoken centers has appeared within professional educational circles.

In 1860, the growth of the free public high school began, and by the turn of the century, there were still a relatively small number of high school students. The change of the public high school from a voluntary and therefore selective system to a compulsory mass system was accompanied by a shift in emphasis from training the mind to the "holding power" of the school. "As the years went by, the schools filled with a growing proportion of doubtful, reluctant, or actually hostile pupils." (p. 327) There was a growing concern with broadening the curriculum, with education for citizenship in a democracy and with training for a vocation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The ground was thus already prepared when John Dewey formulated his educational theories. Educational democracy became a central and popular issue. By the 1940's the most powerful force in American education was the life-adjustment movement, characterized by Mr. Hofstadter as "an attempt on the part of educational leaders and the United States Office of Education to make completely dominant the values of the crusade against intellectualism that had been going on since 1910." (p. 343) The purpose of education should be adjustment to life--if fewer than four out of ten young people were remaining in high school long enough to graduate, the reason was that the curriculum had not been "enriched" enough--it was still too academically oriented. A national conference held in 1947 claimed that twenty per cent of America's high school students were being prepared for college, twenty per cent were being prepared for skilled occupations, but sixty per cent were unfit for either program and should be adjusted to life. "The life-adjustment theorists were explicit about the qualities they attributed to the neglected sixty per cent who needed life-adjustment education. These were mainly children from unskilled and semi-skilled families who had low incomes and provided a poor cultural environment. They began school later than others, continued to be retarded in school, made low grades, scored lower on intelligence and achievement tests, lacked interest in school work, and were 'less emotionally mature--nervous, feel less secure.'" (p. 344) Hofstadter goes on to ask, "What kind of education would be suitable for this unfortunate majority? Certainly not intellectual development nor cumulative knowledge, but practical training in being family members, consumers, and citizens." (p. 344) "Repeatedly, life adjustment educators were to insist that intellectual training is of no use in solving the 'real life problems' of ordinary youth." (p. 345)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The life-adjustment theorists fancied that science had shown them that no mental skills (such as memory, reason, imagination) could be transferred from one situation to another. "The important thing, then, is not to teach pupils how to generalize, but to supply them directly with the information they need for daily living--for example, to teach them, not physiology, but how to keep physically fit." (p. 346) The traditional academic curriculum was viewed as a device to keep large numbers of students from continuing in school in order to select out the abler students. The reliance of this group on the findings of experimental psychologists (notably Thorndike) as to the existence or non-existence of transfer of skills was not, according to Hofstadter, totally scientific. "Their misuse of experimental evidence, in fact, constitutes a major scandal in the history of educational thought. If a quantitive survey of the experiments means anything, these educators ignored the bulk of the material, for four or five of the experimental studies showed the presence of transfer under certain conditions. There seems to have been no point at which the preponderant opinion of outstanding experimental psychologists favored the anti-transfer views that were drawn upon by educationists like Prosser as conclusive on what 'science has proven.' Today, experimental psychology offers them no comfort." (p. 349-350)

But there is more to criticize in the life-adjustment movement than the fact that its scientific support was shakier than its proponents were willing to admit. It was not an attempt to provide different training for those considered unable to benefit from an academic education. It was an attempt to set all educational standards by the needs of those considered uneducable. "Now it was argued that all pupils should in large measure get the kind of train-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing originally conceived for the slow learner. American utility and American democracy would now be realized in the education of *all* youth. The life-adjustment movement would establish once and for all the idea that the slow learner is 'in no sense' the inferior of the gifted...." (p. 352-353) But there is a difference between the two children academically; what does it mean? Democracy in education provides a chilling answer of majority rule. Mr. Hofstadter quotes two different educational reports that seem to hold the position that the child in the minority is the child that must by definition be the misfit. What should the school do for the children with unusual intellectual curiosity? One group of educationists said: "Any help we can give them should be theirs, but such favored people learn directly from their surroundings. Our efforts to teach them are quite incidental in their development. It is therefore unnecessary and futile for the schools to attempt to gear their programs to the needs of unusual people." (quoted on p. 353) And finally, Mr. Hofstadter makes his point by quoting Lloyd E. Blauch, Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education, writing in 1956: "A considerable number of children, estimated at about four million, deviate sufficiently from mental, physical, and behavioral norms to require special educational provision. Among them are the blind and partially seeing, the deaf and the hard of hearing, the speech-defective, the crippled, the delicate, the epileptic, the mentally deficient, the socially maladjusted, *and the extraordinarily gifted*." (p. 354)

What then is the aim of this New Education if it is not to train the mind, to stimulate the intellectually curious, and to develop the extraordinarily gifted? "What it aims to do is not primarily to fit them to become a disciplined part of the world of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

production and competition, ambition and vocation, creativity, and analytic thought, but rather to help them learn the ways of the world of consumption and hobbies, of enjoyment and social complaisance--in short, to adapt gracefully to the passive and hedonistic style summed up in the significant term *adjustment*." (p. 356, Italics his)

Admirers of America are often indignant when this country is called "materialistic" by its critics. This book offers a different slant on that image. There *is* and has been a common American attitude which exalts the practical and the material aspects of life with undue emphasis, but it does not oppose these aspects (as erroneously held by its critics) to the idealistic or value-oriented aspects of life, but to its intellectual and theoretical aspects.

This common attitude has in fact been part of religious movements as well as political movements which have won great success in this country. It is, as Hofstadter has identified, evangelistic and inspirational in religion, homespun in politics, anti-theoretical in business, and anti-intellectual in education. It remains but to point out that in each area the emphasis is on what Ayn Rand has identified as mysticism, as opposed to rationality. The revivalist-fundamentalist emphasis on emotional faith and the ways of the past and an accompanying hostility to learning and expertise have been confused at times with an intellectual devotion to libertarianism. But although they may coincide in their attitudes on some issues, they spring from vastly different personal roots. The fundamentalist in the 1920's who militantly supported Prohibition and considered that he had a right to vote on whether or not biology was taught in the State of Tennessee was not an advocate of a *laissez-faire*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

government. Similarly, the egalitarian political candidate who dominated national politics during the nineteenth century, projecting an image of "just-folks," was not fostering the ideals of Thomas Jefferson--he was the prototype of those who campaigned against Jefferson. The traditional emphasis in the business community on "character" (especially religious character), rather than brilliance, led Henry Ford to spy unbearably on the marriages of his employees and is reflected today in the personnel policy of at least one nationwide corporation which will not employ anyone who has had any psychotherapy. Such an attitude has not caused our explosion of technical innovation--it has, if anything, hampered it.

The area in which anti-intellectualism has been most explicitly and most theoretically formulated is, of course, the area of education, as it is itself an intellectual area. The ideals of life-adjustment gained acceptance in large part because of the emotional value-emphasis that America had placed on democracy and egalitarianism. "The evangelical climate of this country was also a force: the new educators' rhetoric about 'saving' every American child, and their implied promise that the child saved would himself redeem civilization, point to this conclusion." (p. 369) The life-adjustment school of education is based on the assumption that what fills the need of the majority is ideal for all, which assumption in turn is based on the assumption of automatic progress for the human race. No need for individuals to train their minds--the race as a whole is going somewhere.

And so we come to the behind-the-scenes influence of John Dewey, who is the particular educator appealed to by the leaders of this movement, as well as one of the founders of "the uniquely American school of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

philosophy," pragmatism. Professor Edward C. Moore points out in *American Pragmatism: Pierce, James, and Dewey* (Columbia University Press, New York, 1961) that pragmatism not only shared with American protestantism "the right of the individual to insist that old truths be brought to terms with the thoughts of each new thinker," (p. 7) but it also was directly influenced by the tradition of moral idealism. "Moral idealsim," says Professor Moore, "argues that the universe is not the mere blind scurrying of matter but that there is somehow a purpose which is exemplified in and being worked out through the medium of matter and motion....By the time Dewey comes to forumulate his pragmatism the element of purpose is no longer supernatural but natural. It nevertheless plays a dominant role in his thought." (p. 8) Dewey himself said, "Democracy has many meanings, but if it has moral meaning, it is found in resolving that the supreme test of all political institutions and industrial arrangements shall be the contrubution they make to the all-around growth of every member of society." (*Reconstruction in Society*, p. 186, quoted by Moore, p. 244) Moore goes on to characterize Dewey's attitude as follows: "Dewey's views on social, educational, and religious problems are not simply an effort to suggest new and different approaches to these problems, but are based on features of contemporary society which seem to him unsatisfactory. On the social and political level he believes that our behavior suffers from a lack of planning. He suggests that the doctrine of rugged individualism, or *laissez faire*, belongs to an outmoded view of political and economic activity....the only alternative is a type of community consciousness that will develop its own plan to promote economic and political behavior that will work for the best interests of all. The alternative to economic and political anarchy is some type of planning, worked

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out by those involved and cooperatively executed by them." (Moore, p. 256-257)

I should perhaps insert a word of warning here. Mr. Hofstadter has written a book on an interesting subject, in an engaging style. He has referenced his material with care. Being a scholar, he has been careful to point out how easy it would be to overgeneralize from the material he has selected, and to indicate that there are other tendencies in the history of American attitudes which fell outside his chosen area for the book. However, Mr. Hofstadter is a modern liberal intellectual, add suffers from many of the defects of the modern liberal intellectual. He prefers to list characteristics rather than to define the terms "intellectual" and "anti-intellectual." The result of this avoidance of definition is that he creates a picture of the intellectual as a person who holds certain ideas, particularly in economics and politics, rather than a person who is devoted to a rational process. Mr. Hofstadter himself attempts not to project this picture, but his method of listing characteristics and giving examples rather than defining his terms leads to this conclusion.

If pragmatism is, as the material in this book suggests, a philosophy that was formulated out of a traditional American anti-intellectual attitude, then I think it is fair to ask the question: Why has it become so fashionable in intellectual circles? When he is discussing religious history, Mr. Hofstadter can be extremely cogent in pointing out its intellectual defects: "Long before pragmatism became a philosophical creed, it was formulated, albeit in a crude way, by the evangelists. For the layman, the pragmatic test in religion was the experience of conversion; for the clergyman, it was the ability to induce this experience. The minister's success in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

winning souls was taken as the decisive evidence that he preached the truth." (p. 85)

Why then does he seem without question to attribute to intellectuals everywhere a social philosophy which Professor Moore describes as being formulated by John Dewey?

Since he does, in fact, seem to do this, perhaps most of all I should warn the reader that I have been more generous to Mr. Hofstadter than I think he would be to me. He projects a total unawareness of the possibility that anyone might attempt to defend certain "right-wing" views or come to certain "right-wing" conclusions on intellectual rather than on emotional-traditional grounds. In this respect, it is Mr. Hofstadter who is in the so-called "conservative" position of assuming that nothing can meaningfully be said against the establishment, and I can only repeat one of his quotations of John Dewey back to him. Dewey said: "Let us admit the case of the conservative. If we once start thinking, no one can guarantee what will be the outcome, except that many objects, ends and institutions will be surely doomed. Every thinker puts some portion of an apparently stable world in peril, and no one can wholly predict what will emerge in its place." (quoted on p. 45) Mr. Hofstadter then amplifies this by saying, "To those who suspect that intellect is a subversive force in society, it will not do to reply that intellect is really a safe, bland, and emollient thing." (p. 45)

Not only can one still read John Locke and Thomas Jefferson, but a recent poll seeking to determine the favorite authors of freshmen at Columbia College (where Professor Hofstadter teaches) found that ten per cent of this year's entering class ranked Ayn

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rand as their favorite. Mr. Dewey's apparently stable world may be in peril already.

--Joan Kennedy Taylor

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PERSUASION, INC.
260 WEST 86th ST.
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10024
RETURN REQUESTED

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED